



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

7

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,965	09/15/2000	GETHER IRICK JR.	05015.0365U1	3021

7590 01/04/2002

MITCHELL A KATZ
NEEDLE & ROSENBERG P C
127 PEACHTREE STREET, SUITE 1200
THE CANDLER BUILDING
ATLANTA, GA 30303

EXAMINER

SHORT, PATRICIA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1712

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

T-D-7

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/662 965	Irick et al.
Examiner	Group Art Unit	
Short	1712	

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on December 13, 2000.
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 8, 12, 13, 16, 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1-7, 9-11, 14, 15, 17-19, 21-28 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4 Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1712

Claims 8, 12, 13, 16 and 20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14, 15, 17-19 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over each of Blumenthal and Sharak. Each of the references teaches compositions comprising degradable polyester and terpene-phenol resin. The polyesters can be prepared from mixtures of aliphatic and aromatic dicarboxylic acids. See Blumenthal at col. 3, lines 39-65, col. 6, lines 27-28 and examples. See Sharak at col. 2, lines 9-10, col. 4, lines 8-14, col. 5, lines 21-23, examples 8 and 9 and claim 1. The terpene-phenol resin inherently slows the degradation rate of the degradable polyester. Use of an aliphatic-aromatic copolyester is anticipated by or would have been obvious over the teachings of each of the references.

Claims 1-6, 9-11, 14, 15, 17-19, 21-23 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over each of Schoenberg,

Art Unit: 1712

Rutherford, Iovine and Kauffman. Each of the references teaches compositions comprising degradable polyester and terpene-phenol resin. See Schoenberg at col. 6, lines 29-40 and example 6, Rutherford at col. 7, lines 12-2, lines 39-54 and examples 24-26, 52-59, 82-84 and 88-90, Iovine at col. 2, lines 9-12 and examples 3,4 and 7, and Kauffman at col. 3, lines 29-31 and examples. The terpene-phenol resin inherently slows the degradation rate of the degradable polyester.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 7, line 4, the second occurrence of "or" is confusing as it is not clear what is intended.

P. Short

January 3, 2002

Phone (703) 308-2395

Fax (703) 872-9310

PATRICIA A. SHORT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Patricia A. Short